



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,077	01/14/2004	Lance E. Steward	ALLE0014-103 (17355CIP3)	5352
35143	7590	10/12/2006	EXAMINER	
COZEN O' CONNOR 1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508			HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/757,077

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL

Examiner

Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1649

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Sequence Rules***

1. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 because 37 CFR 1.821 (a)(2)(c-d) states that *each sequence disclosed must appear separately in the* “Sequence Listing” and in the text of the description and *claims* whenever described. Note that although only amino acid sequence of 4 or more require their own SEQ ID NO, 37 CFR 1.822(o) states that a sequence made up of *one or more noncontiguous segments* of a larger sequence *or segments from different sequences* shall be presented as a separate sequence. See MPEP 2422 & 2431. Applicant must comply with the requirements of the sequence rules (37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825) before the application can be examined under 35 U.S.C. 131 and 132.

Note that failure to respond to both the requirements for sequence compliance and the restriction requirement below will be held as *nonresponsive*, and may result in *abandonment* of this application.

***Election/Restriction***

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I-VIII. Claims 1-18 & 30-44, drawn to modified botulinum neurotoxins type A, B, C1, C2, D, E, F and G, classified in Class 530, subclass 350.

IX-XV. Claims 19-29, drawn to methods of decreasing an enzymatic activity and/or decreasing a biological persistence of a botulinum toxin type A, B, C1, C2, D, E, F and G, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Art Unit: 1649

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relation of Inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products; restriction is deemed proper because these products appear to constitute patently distinct inventions for the following reason:

Groups I-VIII are directed to products that involve distinct modified botulinum toxins which are structurally and physically unique as illustrated by their unique amino acid sequences. Each of these products can also be prepared by different processes, such as though chemical synthesis or isolation from natural sources using various isolation/purification procedures. It should be noted that if the claims are amended to reflect an individual SEQ ID NO, the claims may be further restricted to a specific SEQ ID NO, in which each mutated botulism toxin, etc. may constitute a separate and distinct invention, again as illustrated by their unique immunologically distinct amino acid sequence, different functional and structural characteristics, and different bacterial strain from which each different serotype is isolated. It is pointed out that there is a proper distinction between these groups, since each product is not required in order for the other to exist. Thereby, these groups are distinct and separable for the reasons stated.

Groups I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the proteins of Group I can be used in other materially different methods, such as to generate antibodies to botulinum toxins. In contrast, the methods

Art Unit: 1649

of decreasing enzymatic activity, etc. in Group II requires enzymatic assays, as well as detection protocols, which are not required in the products of Group I.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, they have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and the non-coextensiveness of the search and examination for each group would constitute an undue burden on the examiner to search and consider all the separable groups with their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).

### ***Conclusion***

5. Lastly, note that *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 37 USPQ2d 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1995) and *In re Brouwer*, 77 F.3d 422, 37 USPQ2d 1663 (Fed. Cir. 1996) addressed the issue of whether an otherwise conventional process could be patented if it were limited to making or using a nonobvious product.

Art Unit: 1649

In situations where product and process claims drawn to independent and distinct inventions are presented in the same application, an applicant may be called upon under 35 U.S.C. §121 to elect claims to either the product or process. The claims to the non-elected invention will be withdrawn from further consideration. However, in the case of an elected product claim, when a product claim is found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim will be rejoined. Withdrawn process claims not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. In the event of rejoinder, the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability. If the application containing the rejoined claims is not in condition for allowance, the subsequent Office action may be made final, or, if the application was already under final rejection, the next Office action may be an advisory action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.  
September 29, 2006

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D.  
PRIMARY EXAMINER